

NOTICE OF MEETING
HILLSIDE REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ST. GEORGE
WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

Public Notice

Notice is hereby given that the Hillside Review Board of the City of St. George, Washington County, Utah, will hold meetings at the referenced site on **Wednesday, April 27, 2022**, commencing on-site at approximately 8:30 a.m.

PRESENT:

James Sullivan
Dave Black
Jeff Mathis
Russ Owens

EXCUSED:

James Dotson
After Item 1 Dave Black

CITY STAFF:

Assistant Public Works Director, Wes Jenkins
Planner III, Mike Hadley
Planner III, Carol Davidson
Development Office Supervisor, Brenda Hatch

1. Consider a request for a Hillside Development Permit to allow the applicant to develop a proposed single-family development. The applicant has provided a slope analysis, proposed drainage report and site layout for consideration. The property is located at 720 W Indian Hills Drive and is zoned Single Family Residential, minimum lot size 10,000 sf (R-1-10) The representative is Taylor Ricks Case No. 2022-HS-010. (*See 'Meeting Place' exhibit below*).

Phil Giles – I'm here on behalf of Tyson Feller and Gary Carter and their family. They are looking at doing a small 10-acre lot subdivision up here. The plan is about 19 to 20 lots. We are here to try and see what our options are. We are trying to get through the Geotech and the hillside. Is it rock slide too Wayne?

Wayne Rogers – Yes, there is rock fall hazard right here on this side. The whole hillside map is high hazard but out in here we don't, also the landslide that is here, pretty much we are at the end of it and we're outside the map zone. As long as we don't come in here and cut out the whole toe of the landslide we are in pretty good shape.

Phil Giles – And that is not the intent, the intent is to step it down as we move to the west.

Wes Jenkins – Is that the parcel over here?

Discussion continued on where we were standing in relation to the map in the hillside packet.

Wes Jenkins – You show some 40% slopes here on the exterior of these lots. What's the anticipation? I noticed there was a hatched pattern underneath that.

Phil Giles – We won't be getting into that other than it's pretty ugly, so we were wondering if we could do just a rockery wall to clean up that edge down on the front. As you get down there you can see it, we want to pretty it up as we build the lots.

Jeff Mathis – So you are talking about these steep rock slopes here.

Wes Jenkins – And the reason you are saying that is because it has been disturbed?

Phil Giles – Yes, it's been disturbed and then pushed down there and just flopped over.

Jeff Mathis – But none of it is natural?

Phil Giles – None of it is really natural, it's been kind of pushed out on there.

Russ Owens – So is that going to be designated as a no build area?

Jeff Mathis – Your map looks like that is a solid line, like that was the end of the construction.

Phil Giles – Correct, yes. We won't build out on there, but it would be nice if there was a way that we could kind of pretty it up a little bit.

James Sullivan – So what we are here to look at would be just the 40% areas around the outside?

Wes Jenkins – And then you have some right here in the interior too.

Phil Giles – We are hoping they are just anomalies where it's been pushed.

Wes Jenkins – And that would have to be the recommendation, that this is not a natural hillside and that these are just anomalies if that's what you want to call them, and they are not contiguous.

Phil Giles – And that's what we would want to propose.

Wes Jenkins – And that's what you would have to decide other than the geologic hazards, but you are saying that rock fall is not an issue.

Wayne Rogers – No and neither is the landslide for this parcel. Going up the hill we would have to look at it closer, but right here it's ok.

Russ Owens – There is no onsite detention?

Phil Giles – Detention is right here in the corner.

Russ Owens – And is there storm drain down there?

Phil Giles – There is storm drain all the way through to Indian Hills Drive. So, we will tie into the existing storm drain system.

Discussion on whether there would be future phases and where they would be located.

Jeff Mathis – So even though this has sagebrush on it, it has probably all been previously disturbed.

Phil Giles – Right, you can see it down here.

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion to recommend for approval phase 1 of the Temple Trail subdivision as presented and in our opinion the interior slopes that are 40% or greater are noncontiguous and they could be disturbed, the slopes around the perimeter of the subdivision are graveled slopes with no natural bedrock outcrops and it would support dressing those with decorative stacked rock or block that matches the natural colors of the area and to dress those up and make those look better and that any retaining walls of the subdivision as well be matched in color to the surrounding natural environment.

SECOND: Jeff Mathis

Jeff Mathis – Do we want to say that we want the walls to be painted?

Dave Black – You have to be careful; the paint looks natural dark black when you are right on the hillside but then as you pull away things get more gray, I would say natural façade would be good, but as you get down here black may not look quite as good. You don't see anything black down here. I think the natural basalt would look good.

Discussion continued on color.

Motion remains as stated and seconded.

AYES (4)

Dave Black

Jeff Mathis

James Sullivan

Russ Owens

NAYS (0)

Motion carries

2. Consider a request to revisit and determine if the proposed location of a house on Lot 120 of Foremaster Ridge meets the 30' ridgeline setback requirement. The applicant is requesting the Hillside Review Board return to this location to determine if the proposed location of the home, setback at 33' from the rear property line, (as opposed to the recommended 35' setback from the rear property line) meets the requirement of the 30' ridgeline setback. The property is generally located at 445 S. Five Sisters Drive and is currently zoned Single Family Residential, minimum lot size 10,000 sf (R-1-10). The applicant is John Wilson. Case No. 2022-HS-011.

James Sullivan – We are coming back to address the setback. The ordinance stipulates that the home must be 30 feet back from the abrupt edge of the hill and that abrupt edge was never established. We are here to establish that line and where that 30 feet is going to fall.

John Wilson – I went through the entire recording last time and pulled out the parts that to me indicated that, my impression was that we were ok moving the house 3 feet back and then we get the 5 in the front with the extra 2 feet that we got in the front. We actually lost 2 feet in the house plan because we decided against the cantilever because the engineer said it would be really expensive and bad for the house. On the second page you will see, and I'll play the audio (played audio from the last meeting which he had transcribed, a copy will be added to the packet), So the 3 feet was mentioned 4 or 5 times, it just didn't end up making it into the motion, I know it's hard to form it on the fly.

Wes Jenkins – We had one of our engineers come out and stakes represent basically what was shown on the plat as the 30-foot line. There is some discussion as to what that line really is. That is where the confusion came in. We staked the line so that you would have a reference point as to why the applicants want to do this.

John Wilson – So we are wanting to come 3 feet back, we're asking to lose 3 feet, but not to lose 5 feet. The further back we get the less views of Pine Valley we get and when we talked last time that was our impression the 3 feet was mentioned over and over.

Wes Jenkins – The challenge on these to be honest with you is it's never one straight line. You kind of have to look at it and make some determinations.

John Wilson – It will make a difference on whether we build or not unfortunately.

Jeff Mathis – I will speak from what I remember, and I was on your recording. From what I remember I think what you're stating is accurate. We said you could have the 5-foot reduction in the front for pop outs or different things, but the back set back could be the 3 to 5 feet. That's kind of how I remember it.

Russ Owens – That's the way I remember it.

Jeff Mathis – We said they could get a 3-to-5-foot reduction in the front to make some articulation in the house, but I did feel that this 3 foot back here was also what we discussed.

Wes Jenkins – And the motion just wasn't made that way.

John Wilson – Could we state that the cliff is 3 ft in from the property line?

Jeff Mathis – I think the way I would like to form the motion is based on the platted 30-foot line, we will give you like your drawing shows an additional 3 feet back from that, but not the required 5. That way we have established a line on the plat and have given you, we pushed that 30-foot line back 3 feet but not 5. Is that what you are looking for?

John Wilson – Can we say that the house can be built, the house has to be 33 ft back from the rear property line?

Russ Owens – It is easier if you’ve got this line established here, to go off of this line because it is still going to be ambiguous.

Jeff Mathis – Yeah, we can’t find your rear property line.

John Wilson – Well if we go from the front? Because it’s a hundred feet back to the rear property line so.

Wes Jenkins – This line here represents 30-feet off of your property line.

Jeff Mathis – Yes, this represents 30-feet off your property line so if we say 3-feet off that there is no ambiguity there.

MOTION: Jeff Mathis made a motion that we recommend approval and we clarify our previous motion that the setback off the rear property line will be 33 feet back or 3 feet back from the plotted 30-foot setback, that covers both sides, the back of the house can be within 33-feet from the back property line and the front of the house still recommend anywhere from a 3 to 5 foot reduction in the front setback for them to do architectural design in that additional 5 feet to make the house work.

SECOND: Russ

AYES (3)

Jeff Mathis

James Sullivan

Russ Owens

NAYS (0)

Motion carries

3. Consider approval of the meeting minutes from March 23, 2022.

MOTION: Russ Owens made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 23, 2022, meeting with the correction mentioned.

SECOND: Jeff Mathis

AYES (3)

Jeff Mathis

James Sullivan

Russ Owens

NAYS (0)

Motion carries